UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/076,831	02/14/2002	Dhinakar Radhakrishnan	020162	1560

23696	7590	12/16/2004

Qualcomm Incorporated
Patents Department
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, CA 92121-1714

EXAMINER
ODLAND, DAVID E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2662	

DATE MAILED: 12/16/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/076,831	RADHAKRISHNAN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	David Odland	2662	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _09 August 2004_.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
  closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) _1,3-26,28-40 and 43-50_ is/are pending in the application.
  4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) _1,3-26,28-40 and 43-50_ is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
  Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
  Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
    1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
    3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
      application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
  Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
  Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1.   .   The following is a response to the amendments filed on 08/09/2004.

Claim Objections

2.   In claim 16, the period after the term 'MSC' in line 6 should be deleted. Appropriate

correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.   .

4.   Claims 1 and 3-5, as best understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being

anticipated by Brown et al. (USPN 5,537,474), hereafter referred to as Brown.

Referring to claim 1, Brown discloses a code division multiple access (CDMA) mobile

station (MS) (a CDMA compliant subscriber unit (SU) (see column 5 lines 13-38 and figure 2)),

comprising:

a radio circuit configured to communicate with a CDMA radio access network (RAN) using CDMA protocol (the SU has circuitry to communicate with a CDMA network (see (see column 5 lines 13-38 and figure 2)); and

a subscriber circuit configured to communicate with a GSM subscriber identity module (SIM) (the SU also has circuitry to communicate with a subscriber identification unit (SUI) which comprises a SIM (see column 5 lines 13-38 and figure 2)) to permit the MS to authenticate itself with a GSM core infrastructure, whereby use of the CDMA RAN with the GSM core infrastructure is facilitated (the SU communicates with the CDMA network by authenticating itself through the use of the SIU which is a uses a GSM based protocol ((see column 5 lines 13-38 and figure 2)); and the SIM, wherein the SIM is configured to store GSM application file level data (the SIM stores an IMSI, which can be considered 'GSM application file level data' (see column 3 lines 21-67)) and telecom level data (the SIM also stores a secret key, which can be considered 'telecom level data' (see column 1 lines 21-67)), and execute commands related to a card holder verification feature (the SIM comprises a microprocessor and memory for executing commands to perform an authentication algorithm (see abstract and column 3)), including enabling and disabling the CRV feature (the SIM card can be removed from the mobile unit thus all functions related to the SIM card can be enabled or disabled by doing so (see column 5)).

Referring to claim 3, Brown discloses the system discussed above. Furthermore, Brown discloses that the MS reads at least one identifier from the SIM upon engagement of the SIM with the MS (the SU reads an unique identity number from the SIM (see column 5 lines 39-67 and figure 2)).

Referring to claim 4, Brown discloses the system discussed above. Furthermore, Brown

discloses that the identifier is an International Mobile Subscriber Identity (IMSI) (the identifier is

an IMSI number (see column 5 lines 39-67 and figure 2)).

Referring to claim 5, Brown discloses the system discussed above. Furthermore, Brown

discloses the IMSI being transmitted by the MS in at least one message (the IMSI is reported to

the GSM system (see column 10 lines 8-15)).

5.   Claims 16-18 and 28-32, as best understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being

anticipated by Ahn et al. (Publication number 2002/0061745), hereafter referred to as Ahn.

Referring to claim 16, Ahn discloses a method for facilitating the use of a CDMA RAN

with a GSM core infrastructure (a CDMA system is used in conjunction with a GSM system (see

figure 3 and abstract)), comprising:

engaging a SIM with a CDMA MS (a CDMA mobile terminal has a SIM installed thereto

(see abstract and figure 3));

transmitting at least one IMSI stored on the SIM to an MSC using a CDMA RAN (the

CDMA terminal transmits the IMSI to the MSC (see page 3 paragraph 0043)).

using the IMSI, authenticating the SIM with a GSM core infrastructure (the IMSI is used

to authenticate the SIM of the CDMA terminal with the GSM network (see page 3 paragraphs

0045-0051);

based on the authenticating act, registering the MS with SIM with the MSC (if the

authentication is successful and it is determined the user is legitimate, the CDMA terminal is

registered with the MSC (see page 3 paragraph 0053-0054)); storing GSM application file level

data in the SIM (the SIM stores an IMSI, which can be considered 'GSM application file level

data' (see paragraph 0043)); storing telecom level data in the SIM (the SIM stores a RAND and

also is used in the storing and transmitting of SMS, which can both be considered 'telecom level

data' (see paragraph 0049)) and executing commands by the SIM related to a card holder

verification feature (the SIM is used to execute authentication algorithms (see paragraph 0049)),

including enabling and disabling the CHV feature (the authentication algorithm takes place only

when desired via a request and then when the algorithm is complete it is thus not enabled any

more in the phone (see page 3 paragraphs 0045 – 0051)).

Referring to claim 17, Ahn discloses the system discussed above. Furthermore, Ahn

discloses transmitting the IMSI in at least one message (the IMSI is transmitted to the MSC (see

page 3 paragraph 0043)).

Referring to claim 18, Ahn discloses the system discussed above. Furthermore, Ahn

discloses that the message is a registration message (the IMSI is send to the MSC to in a

registration request from the CDMA terminal see page 3 paragraph 0043)).

Referring to claim 28, Ahn discloses a system for facilitating the use of a CDMA RAN

with a GSM core infrastructure (a CDMA system is used in conjunction with a GSM system (see

figure 3 and abstract)), comprising:

an MSC communicating with the CDMA RAN using CDMA protocol (an MSC

communicates in a CDMA network using the CDMA protocol (see page 3 paragraphs 0043 and

0044)), the MSC also communicating with the GSM core infrastructure using GSM protocol (the

MSC communicates with the GSM network (see page 3 paragraphs 0043-0045));

at least one MS communicating with the CDMA RAN and having a registration in the

GSM core infrastructure (the user CDMA terminal is a GSM service subscriber (see paragraph 0045)); and

at least one SIM detachably engageable with the MS, wherein the SIM is configured to store GSM application file level data (the SIM stores an IMSI, which can be considered 'GSM application file level data' (see paragraph 0043)) and telecom level data (the SIM stores a RAND and also is used in the storing and transmitting of SMS, which can both be considered 'telecom level data' (see paragraph 0049)), and

authenticate the MS with the GSM core infrastructure and execute commands related to a card holder verification feature (the SIM is used to execute authentication algorithms that include commands (see paragraph 0049)), including enabling and disabling the CRV feature (the SIM card can be removed thus all functions related to the SIM card can be enabled or disabled by doing so (see figures 7 and 8)).

Referring to claim 29, Ahn discloses the system discussed above. Furthermore, Ahn discloses that the MS reads at least one identifier from the SIM upon engagement of the SIM with the MS (the CDMA terminal reads and transmits the IMSI to the MSC (see page 3 paragraph 0043)).

Referring to claim 30, Ahn discloses the system discussed above. Furthermore, Ahn discloses that the identifier is an International Mobile Subscriber Identity (IMSI) (the identifier is an IMSI number (see page 3 paragraph 0043)).

Referring to claim 31, Ahn discloses the system discussed above. Furthermore, Ahn discloses transmitting the IMSI in at least one message (the IMSI is transmitted to the MSC (see page 3 paragraph 0043)).

Referring to claim 32, Ahn discloses the system discussed above. Furthermore, Ahn

discloses that the message is a registration message (the IMSI is send to the MSC to in a

registration request from the CDMA terminal see page 3 paragraph 0043)).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 6-8, as best understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Brown in view of Thomas (USPN 6,014,558), hereafter referred to as Thomas.

Referring to claims 6-8, Brown discloses the system discussed above. Brown does not

disclose that the messages are registration, origination or page response messages. However, as

shown in Thomas it is a well-known standardized process in the art for mobile units to transmit

mobile subscriber identity numbers in messages related to registration, origination and paging

messages (see column 2 lines 43-65). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the

time of the invention to transmit the IMSI number disclosed in Brown in registration, origination

and page response messages, as taught in Thomas, because sending such identification numbers

in these kinds of messages is well known and therefore doing so would reduce developmental

costs that would be incurred if an entirely new type of message was to be implemented.

7.   Claim 9, as best understood, is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Brown in view of Tiedemann (USPN 5,862,471), hereafter referred to as Tiedemann.

        Referring to claim 9, Brown discloses the system discussed above. Brown does not

disclose that the MS selectively displays at least one service provider name. However,

Tiedemann discloses of a system wherein mobile stations display the name of the service

provider that is serving the mobile station (see column 2 lines 50-58)). It would have been

obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to have the SU of Brown display the

name of the service provider, as taught in Tiedemann, because as Tiedemann points out in

column 2 lines 56-58, by knowing the name of the service provider a user can make a more

educated estimate of roaming costs. This is particularly beneficial in Brown since the SU in

Brown roams between GSM and CDMA networks.

8.   Claim 10, as best understood, is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Brown in view of Skog (USPN 5,930,701), hereafter referred to as Skog.

        Referring to claim 10, Brown discloses the system discussed above. Brown does not

disclose that the MS selectively displays at least one mobile directory number. However, Skog

discloses a system wherein the mobile stations display directory numbers (see column 8 lines 45-

51)). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to display

directory numbers, as taught in Skog, in the system of Brown because as Skog points out in

column 8 lines 48-51 displaying the number enables the mobile subscriber to be informed of the

calling part directory number associated with an incoming call that was attempted when the

mobile station was unreachable. This would make the system of Brown more reliable and

versatile in that when the mobile station in Brown is powered-up after being powered down for a

period of time the user of the mobile station will know the number of the person who was trying

to reach them during the powered-down period.

9.   Claim 11, as best understood, is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Brown in view of Maruyama (USPN 5,646,604), hereafter referred to as Maruyama.

Referring to claim 11, Brown discloses the system discussed above. Brown does not

disclose that the MS permits a user to use the MS only if the user inputs a predetermined

verification value to the MS. However, Maruyama discloses a system wherein a user of a mobile

unit must insert a personal identification code in order to operate the mobile station (see abstract

and column 1 lines 19-57)). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of

the invention to implement the code inserting operation taught in Maruyama, in the system of

Brown because doing so would increase the level of security associated with the mobile unit by

preventing individuals that do not know the personal identification code from using the mobile

unit.

10.   Claims 12-14, as best understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Brown in view of Cassidy et al. (USPN 6,480,725), hereafter referred to as

Cassidy.

Referring to claim 12, Brown discloses the system discussed above. Brown does not

disclose that the MS terminates a call upon removal of the SIM from the MS. However, Cassidy

discloses a system comprising mobile stations wherein when SIM cards are removed from the

mobile station any call in progress is terminated (see column 5 lines 1-9)). It would have been

obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to terminate calls made by the mobile

unit in Brown when the SIM is removed, as taught in Cassidy, because doing so would increase

security of the system. Namely, since the SIM card is used for encrypting messages

communicated by the mobile station, removing the SIM would submit any communications

made by the mobile station to possible malicious entities; therefore terminating the call when the

SIM is removed will prevent this from occurring.

Referring to claim 13, Brown discloses the system discussed above. Brown does not

disclose deleting the subscriber information upon removal of the SIM from the MS. However, it

would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to delete the

subscriber's information when the SIM is removed because since the SIM is removed the mobile

unit is not being used to make calls and therefore there is no need to retain the subscribers

information any longer. Furthermore, retaining the subscribers information requires utilizing

memory space in the mobile unit and so deleting this information when its not being used will

increase the unused memory capacity of the mobile unit and therefore there will be more

memory available for use by other information.

Referring to claim 14, Brown discloses the system discussed above. Brown does not

disclose that the MS periodically checks for the presence of the SIM in the MS and terminates a

call when the MS determines that the SIM is no longer engaged with the MS. However, Cassidy

discloses of a system wherein a mobile unit periodically checks for the SIM card and terminates

calls when the SIM is removed and therefore determined not to be present (see column 4 lines

58-67 and column 5 lines 1-9)). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of

the invention to, in the system of Brown, periodically check for the presence of a SIM and

terminating calls when the SIM is not present, as taught in Cassidy, because doing so would

increase the security of the Brown system. Namely, since the SIM card is used for encrypting

messages communicated by the mobile station, it is important to check and determine if the card

is present in order to prevent any communications to be intercepted by possible malicious

entities; therefore determining if the SIM is present and terminating the call when the SIM is not

present will prevent this from occurring.

11.   Claim 15, as best understood, is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Brown.

        Referring to claim 15, Brown discloses the system discussed above. Brown does not

disclose that the MS uses cdma2000 principles. However, it would have been obvious to one

skilled in the art at the time of the invention to utilize the already existing cdma2000 protocol in

the system of Brown because doing so would decrease development costs since an entirely new

protocol would not have to be used to implement the system of Brown.

12.   Claims 19,20,33 and 34, as best understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Ahn in view of Thomas.

        Referring to claims 19, 20, 33 and 34, Ahn discloses the system discussed above. Ahn

does not disclose that the messages are origination or page response messages. However, as

shown in Thomas it is a well-known standardized process in the art for mobile units to transmit

mobile subscriber identity numbers in messages related to origination and paging messages (see

column 2 lines 43-65). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the

invention to transmit the IMSI number disclosed in Ahn in origination and page response

messages, as taught in Thomas, because sending such identification numbers in these kinds of

messages is well-known and therefore doing so would reduce developmental costs that would be

incurred if an entirely new type of message was to be implemented.

13.   Claims 21 and 35, as best understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Ahn in view of Tiedemann.

Referring to claims 21 and 35, Ahn discloses the system discussed above. Ahn does not

disclose that the MS selectively displays at least one service provider name. However,

Tiedemann discloses of a system wherein mobile stations display the name of the service

provider that is serving the mobile station (see column 2 lines 50-58)). It would have been

obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to have the CDMA terminal of Ahn

display the name of the service provider, as taught in Tiedemann, because as Tiedemann points

out in column 2 lines 56-58, by knowing the name of the service provider a user can make a

more educated estimate of roaming costs. This is particularly beneficial in Ahn since the CDMA

terminal in Ahn roams between GSM and CDMA networks.

14.   Claims 22 and 36, as best understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Ahn in view of Skog.

Referring to claims 22 and 36, Ahn discloses the system discussed above. Ahn does not

disclose that the MS selectively displays at least one mobile directory number. However, Skog

discloses a system wherein the mobile stations display directory numbers (see column 8 lines 45-51)). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to display directory numbers, as taught in Skog, in the system of Ahn because, as Skog points out in column 8 lines 48-51, displaying the number enables the mobile subscriber to be informed of the calling part directory number associated with an incoming call that was attempted when the mobile station was unreachable. This would make the system of Ahn more reliable and versatile in that when the CDMA terminal in Ahn is powered-up after being powered down for a period of time the user of the mobile station will know the number of the person who was trying to reach them during the powered-down period.

15.   Claims 23 and 37, as best understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ahn in view of Maruyama.

Referring to claims 23 and 37, Ahn discloses the system discussed above. Ahn does not disclose that the MS permits a user to use the MS only if the user inputs a predetermined verification value to the MS. However, Maruyama discloses a system wherein a user of a mobile unit must insert a personal identification code in order to operate the mobile station (see abstract and column 1 lines 19-57)). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to implement the code inserting operation taught in Maruyama, in the system of Ahn because doing so would increase the level of security associated with the CDMA terminal by preventing individuals that do not know the personal identification code from using the mobile unit.

16.   Claims 24-26 and 38-40, as best understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Ahn in view of Cassidy.

        Referring to claims 24 and 38, Ahn discloses the system discussed above. Ahn does not

disclose that the MS terminates a call upon removal of the SIM from the MS. However, Cassidy

discloses a system comprising mobile stations wherein when SIM cards are removed from the

mobile station any call in progress is terminated (see column 5 lines 1-9)). It would have been

obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to terminate calls made by the

CDMA terminal in Ahn when the SIM is removed, as taught in Cassidy, because doing so would

increase security of the system. Namely, since the SIM card is used for encrypting messages

communicated by the CDMA terminal, removing the SIM would submit any communications

made by the mobile station to interception by possible malicious entities; therefore terminating

the call when the SIM is removed will prevent this from occurring.

        Referring to claims 25 and 39, Ahn discloses the system discussed above. Ahn does not

disclose deleting the subscriber information upon removal of the SIM from the MS. However, it

would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to delete the

subscribers information when the SIM is removed because since the SIM is removed the mobile

unit is not being used to make calls and therefore there is no need to retain the subscribers

information any longer. Furthermore, retaining the subscribers information requires utilizing

memory space in the mobile unit and so deleting this information when its not being used will

increase the unused memory capacity of the mobile unit and therefore there will be more

memory available for use by other information.

Referring to claims 26 and 40, Ahn discloses the system discussed above. Ahn does not

disclose that the MS periodically checks for the presence of the SIM in the MS and terminates a

call when the MS determines that the SIM is no longer engaged with the MS. However, Cassidy

discloses of a system wherein a mobile unit periodically checks for the SIM card and terminates

calls when the SIM is removed and therefore determined not to be present (see column 4 lines

58-67 and column 5 lines 1-9)). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of

the invention to, in the system of Ahn, periodically check for the presence of a SIM and

terminating calls when the SIM is not present, as taught in Cassidy, because doing so would

increase the security of the Ahn system. Namely, since the SIM card is used for encrypting

messages communicated by the mobile station, it is important to check and determine if the card

is present in order to prevent any communications to be intercepted by possible malicious

entities; therefore determining if the SIM is present and terminating the call when the SIM is not

present will prevent this from occurring.

17.   Claims 43-50, as best understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Brown in view of Kolev et al. (USPN 5,884,168), hereafter referred to as

Kolev.

Referring to claims 43-50, Brown discloses the system discussed above. Brown does not

disclose that the GSM application file level data comprises language preferences of an MS user,

a service provider of an MS user, an accumulated call meter of an MS user, a service table

indicating allocated services, a SIM/MS association, a price per unit/currency table. Brown also

does not disclose that the SIM also stores a broadcast message identifier or a broadcast control

channel designation. However, Kolev discloses a GSM system wherein a SIM card stores all of

the above listed values (see the column entitled 'SIM EF' in Table 1 that is located in column 8

lines 5-49)). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to

store such information in the Brown system because doing so would make Brown more user-

friendly, reliable, flexible, secure and efficient. Note, the 'group ID level' values listed in Table

1 of Kolev correspond to the SIM/MS associations as recited in claim 47 and described in the

specification.

Response to Arguments

18.   Applicant's arguments filed 08/09/2004 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive.

On page 10 regarding claims 1,16 and 28, the Applicant contends that none of the

references including Brown recite executing commands that relating to enabling and disabling

the CHV feature. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Brown points out in column 4 lines 51-

57 that the authentication *may* take place upon invoking special services or upon the occurrence

of predetermined traffic or upon events such as a request for a call. Thus, the processor must be

executing commands in order to determine if the authentication algorithm is to be performed (i.e.

enabled) and inherently at some point the processor will complete the authentication process and

will cease to perform authentication (i.e. disable the feature). Also, Ahn discloses receiving a

request to perform the authentication thus its processor must process this request and therefore

commands are executed (see page 3 paragraphs 0045-0051). Similar to Brown the authentication

must at some point complete and then it will be disabled since it is not required anymore.

Conclusion

19.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing

date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to David Odland, who can be reached at (703) 305-3231 on Monday

– Friday during the hours of 8am to 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Hassan Kizou, can be reached at (703) 305-4744. The fax number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9314.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding

should be directed to the receptionist, who can be reached at (703) 305-4750.

deo

December 8, 2004

HASSAN KIZOU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600